

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification and claims 6, 14, 18, 22-25, 27 and 28 have been amended. Claims 1-5, 11-13 and 19-21 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, thus claims 6-10, 14-18, and 22-28 pending and under consideration. No new matter is included in this amendment.

Specification Amendment:

The specification is amended at paragraph [0019] to correct an error so as to be consistent with claim 24.

Other Claim Amendments:

The following comments are provided regarding claims amended to improve form and not otherwise mentioned below. Claim 27 is amended so that "the first error signal" has an appropriate antecedent basis in claim 25. Claim 28 is amended to provide a "." at the end of the claim.

The First 35 U.S.C. §102(b) Rejection:

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 4, 11 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,920,527 to Maeda. Claims 1, 4, 11 and 19 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer; thus, the rejection of claims 1, 4, 11 and 19 as being anticipated by Maeda is moot.

The Second 35 U.S.C. §102(b) Rejection:

At page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 11, 12, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,930,213 to Yamanaka. Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 11, 19 and 20 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer; thus, the rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 11, 12, 19 and 20 as being anticipated by Yamanaka is moot.

The 35 U.S.C. §102(e) Rejection:

At page 4 of the Office Action, claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,418,095 to Sano et al. Claim 18 has been amended as set forth above. In Sano et al., the output of adder 407 corresponds to a sum of the first and fourth signals as recited in amended claim 18 and the output of adder 408 corresponds to a sum of the second and fourth signals as recited in amended claim 18. Thus, amended claim 18 distinguishes from Sano et al.

The First 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection:

At page 5 of the Office Action, claims 2, 13, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamanaka in view of Sano et al. Claims 2, 13 and 21 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, thus the rejection of claims 2, 13 and 21 is moot.

The Second 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection:

At page 5 of the Office Action, claims 23-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamanaka. Claims 23-25 have been amended to depend from claim 22. Thus, claims 23-25 are deemed to be patentable at least for similar reasons set forth regarding claim 22 and claims 26-29 are deemed to be patentable at least for similar reasons set forth regarding claim 25.

Allowable Subject Matter:

At page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that claims 6-10 and 17 are allowed and that claims 14-16 and 22 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 14 and 22 have been so amended. Thus, claims 6-10, 14-16, 17 and 22 are deemed to be in allowable form.

Conclusion:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 11/19/04

Stowe

Registration No. 32,863

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700

Washington, D.C. 20005 Telephone: (202) 434-1500 Facsimile: (202) 434-1501